DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 762 TM 011 047

AUTHOR Leitner, David
TITLE ECIA Chapter 1 Program Improvement Project in the Portland Public Schools. 1986-87 Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Portland Public Schools, OR. Research and Evaluation Dept.
PUB DATE Sep 87
NOTE 34p.; Appendix B contains small print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; *Educational Assessment; Educational Development; Elementary Secondary Education; *Formative Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Program Improvement; Technical Assistance
IDENTIFIERS Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; Oregon (Portland)

ABSTRACT

The Chapter 1 Program Improvement Project of the Portland (Oregon) Public Schools was designed to provide technical assistance to schools in order to facilitate program change and improve student achievement. The project was a joint effort by the Technical Assistance Center of the Northwest Regional Educational Center and the Portland District Chapter 1 Office. Program improvement was presented in a workshop series, relying on communication of the following seven-step process: (1) profiling program performance; (2) setting a goal; (3) assessing program attributes; (4) choosing a target area for improvement; (5) planning implementation; (6) implementing the plan; and (7) evaluating change. School programs were planned and implemented by school leadership teams consisting of the principal, a Chapter 1 coordinator, a regular classroom teacher, and a member of the District Chapter 1 Office or evaluation staff. Each project school chose a target area for program improvement from a list of 13 attributes of effective schools. Evaluation of formative data and participant opinions indicated that participants were enthusiastic about the project and wanted it to continue. Evaluation instruments are appended. (TJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED291762

1986-87 EVALUATION REPORT

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PROJECT ECIA, CHAPTER 1

IN THE PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
David Leitner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Research and Evaluation Dept.
Portland Public Schools
Portland, Oregon
Walter E. Hathaway, Director

David Leitner
September, 1987

TM011 047

ECIA, CHAPTER 1

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

1986-87

David Leitner

Research and Evaluation Department
Portland Public Schools
Portland, Oregon

ECIA, Chapter 1
Program Improvement Project
Administrative Summary

The Chapter 1 Program Improvement Project was a joint effort between the Technical Assistance Center of the Northwest Regional Educational Center (NWREL) and the District Chapter 1 Office. The purpose of the project was to provide technical assistance to schools in order to facilitate program change and improve student achievement. At the invitation of NWREL and District Chapter 1 administrative personnel, four schools chose to participate: Beach, Buckman, Chief Joseph and Tubman Middle School.

The project was an adaption of a model of program improvement developed by Robert Blum at the NWREL which is based on findings from effective schools research. Program improvement was presented in a workshop series as a seven step process: profiling program performance, setting a goal, assessing program attributes, choosing a target area for improvement, planning the implementation, implementing the plan, and evaluating the change. School programs were planned and implemented by school leadership teams formed for the project. These leadership teams consisted of the principal, Chapter 1 Coordinator, a regular classroom teacher and a member of the District Chapter 1 Office or evaluation staff.

Each project school chose a target area for program improvement from a list of 13 attributes of effective schools. Beach, Chief Joseph and Tubman chose coordinating the curricula between Chapter 1 and regular classroom programs and Buckman chose encouraging parent involvement in instructional activities. The schools developed implementation plans for the target areas and began implementation during the year.

Originally, both formative and summative information were to be collected for the evaluation; however, due to the late start and implementation of program plans it was unrealistic to expect that projects would impact student achievement this year. Thus, summative data were not collected. Information was collected on how participants felt about the project and about the workshop series. The results indicated that participants were optimistic about the improvement project, would encourage others to participate, planned to continue the project next year and thought the project would impact student achievement in the coming year. Overall, they thought the activities in the workshop series met their expectation but felt that several changes would improve the workshop series.

The project was successful in gaining and maintaining the interest of project participants and in impacting program improvement. It is recommended that additional resources be made available to ensure that schools have the time necessary for planning their projects and suggested changes in the workshop series are made based on input from project participants.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. School Descriptions	3
3. Summary of Questionnaire Results	7
a. Program improvement process	7
b. Program improvement workshop series	8
4. Conclusions and Recommendations	11
5. Appendices	12

INTRODUCTION

The Portland Chapter 1 Program Improvement Project is a joint effort between the Technical Assistance Center of the Northwest Regional Education Center (NWREL) and the Portland District Chapter 1 Office. The project was originally planned and developed by NWREL as an avenue for Chapter 1 program improvement. It is consistent with their objective of providing technical assistance to Chapter 1 programs to facilitate program improvement. The general plan is to help schools identify and implement a practice or attribute from the effective schools research in their Chapter 1 program.

At the invitation of NWREL and District Chapter 1 administrative personnel, Chapter 1 schools were invited to participate in the Chapter 1 Program Improvement Project. Nine schools expressed interest and five attended an orientation presented by NWREL. Four schools ultimately decided to participate in the project and became the pilot schools for the Portland Chapter 1 Program Improvement Project (PIP). The schools were Beach, Buckman, Chief Joseph and Tubman Middle School.

Project Description:

PIP is based on a model of program improvement developed by Robert Blum at the NWREL. According to the model, there are six categories of factors that impact program improvement: teacher effects, school effects, curriculum alignment, instructional

leadership, program coupling and implementation research. Target areas for program improvement were drawn from these categories. The process of program improvement was presented as a seven step process of profiling program performance, setting a goal, assessing program attributes, choosing a target area for improvement, planning the implementation, implementing the plan, and then assessing and reviewing the impact of the changes.

The role of NWREL in the project was to provide technical assistance by providing three workshops and to help monitor the progress of program projects. During the first workshop, schools learned about 13 attributes of effective schools as identified in the research, profiled the achievement performance of Chapter 1 students at their school and identified a goal for their project based on the achievement profile. See Appendix A for a list of the 13 effective school attributes. During the second workshop, schools explored further the effective school research, completed and summarized a self-assessment of their Chapter 1 programs, identified a target area or attribute for improvement based on the results of their program assessment, and developed a prescription for program improvement. Schools were then assigned the task of developing and implementing a plan based on their prescription. At the end of the year, NWREL held a final workshop in order to review the projects' progress and determine project needs for next year. NWREL did not monitor the programs as originally planned.

School leadership teams were key to the program improvement

process: they attended the workshop series and were responsible for implementing the projects. Each team consisted of the principal, the Chapter 1 Coordinator, a regular classroom teacher, and a member from the District Chapter 1 staff. One school also included an administrative assistant and another school included a second Chapter 1 teacher as members of their leadership teams. The participation of a teacher from the regular school program was seen as a way to bridge the gap between Chapter 1 and the regular school program.

School Plans:

Each team completed the Management and Monitoring Matrix for the project which identified the tasks, responsibilities and timeline. This section briefly summarizes the information on each school's matrix: project goal, the area that the school targeted for improvement and the plans that were developed for improvement. See Appendix B for copies of the Management and Monitoring Matrices. See Table 1 for a summary of the goals, target areas and plans for the projects.

Beach: The goal of the project was to increase student achievement in reading. The target area for the project was the coordination of curricula between the regular classroom and Chapter 1 programs. The leadership team developed a plan to introduce an "In-Focus" card on which classroom teachers would suggest the skills students needed to work on in Chapter 1.

Chapter 1, in turn, would share the diagnostic information generated from the Chapter 1 program with the regular classroom teachers.

Buckman: The goal of the project was to increase the reading skills of students, especially in the area of word meaning. The target area was to increase parent involvement in the Chapter 1 program. The plan was to increase opportunities for parent involvement in helping their children by creating a newsletter, sponsoring parent workshops and providing home instructional materials.

Chief Joseph: The goal of the project was to increase student reading skills. They planned to increase reading skills by increasing parent/community involvement in the Chapter I program. A model for systematic communication with parents through weekly brochures and parent conferences was planned.

Tubman: The goal of the project was to increase student achievement in literal comprehension and word problem solving skills. This was to be accomplished by the coordination of the curricula between the Chapter 1 and regular school programs. The plan was to have Chapter 1 staff attend biweekly team meetings in order to develop coordinated instructional activities for students.

Table 1

Goals, Target Areas and Plans for Project Schools

SCHOOL	GOAL	TARGET AREA	PLAN
Beach	Increase Reading Skills	Coordinate Curricula	Introduce In-Focus Card
Buckman	Increase Reading Skills (Word Meaning)	Parent Involvement	*Create Newsletter *Parent Workshops *Home Instructional Materials
Chief Joseph	Increase Reading Skills	Parent Involvement	*Develop brochure *Reg. communication *Home support
Tubman	Increase Lit. Comp. and Word Problem Skills	Coordinate Curricula	*Team meetings

Project Progress:

The project was planned so schools could successfully implement their plans during the first year; however, the project fell behind schedule for two reasons. First, the workshops were held later in the year than originally planned so schools did not have sufficient time to implement their projects fully. Second, originally schools were to complete their implementation plans at the second workshop. however, there was insufficient time during the workshop to complete the task and schools were left on their own to complete the plan. As a result, plans were not completed until November and December, and implementation was delayed until January and February. Below is a brief description of the progress of the four projects.

Beach: The leadership team created an "In-Focus Card" in order to coordinate the curricula between Chapter 1 and regular school programs. The card went through extensive review and revision with staff. When the In-Focus card was implemented, they found it too complex and time consuming for the intended purpose. Although, they continued to use the card until the end of the year, they plan to use an earlier, less detailed version of the card for next year.

Buckman: The Chapter 1 staff held two parent workshops to instruct parents on working with their children at home. Instructional materials were provided for parents. About 35 parents attended the two workshops. The staff did not have the time to develop a newsletter as planned originally.

Chief Joseph: The original target area was to increase parent involvement in the instruction of their children. Before the plan was fully implemented, the team realized that good communication between Chapter 1 and the regular school program was essential before focusing on parent involvement. Thus, the target area was changed. The leadership team decided to work on the coordination of instructional programs of regular classrooms and Chapter 1. A new plan was developed for coordinating instructional activities.

Tubman: The staff implemented their plan of including the Chapter

1 staff at team meetings. Here, Chapter 1 and non-chapter 1 staff agreed on the content and skills to be taught across each grade level, and in Chapter 1. Later, the leadership team realized, based on readings in the PIP workshop series, that their Chapter 1 students were not receiving sufficient learning time. The available time was further eroded by student transition between regular and Chapter 1 classrooms. Thus, the leadership team plans to restructure the program in order to increase the students' available learning time next year.

Evaluation Plan:

The evaluation was requested by the District Chapter 1 Coordinator. Originally, both formative and summative data were to be collected. However, due to the project's late start and because two schools did not begin to implement their plans until February, it was unrealistic to expect much program impact on student achievement. Thus, summative data on the program's impact on student achievement were not collected.

Formative data were collected in order to guide District Chapter 1 staff in working with NWREL to improve the project for next year. Two questionnaires were developed to collect that information. One questionnaire asked project participants how they felt about the process of program improvement (Appendix C) and the other asked leadership teams to assess the workshop series provided to the schools (See Appendix D). The questionnaires were sent to leadership team members at the

schools in April, 1987, after the initial workshop series was completed. Of the 12 questionnaires that were sent to team members, 10 were returned.

Results:

The results of the questionnaires are summarized on the copies of the questionnaires in Appendices C and D. The frequencies of responses appear in parentheses on the scale for each question. Some respondents did not answer every question so there are not always 10 responses per question. Below is a brief interpretation of the results for the PIP process and workshop questionnaires.

The PIP Questionnaire:

The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine how project participants felt about the program improvement process. The results from the questionnaire show that members of the leadership teams had different degrees of familiarity with the effective schools research prior to participating in the project. Overall, they were receptive to being part of a program improvement process and, after the workshop series, were still willing to continue with the project. In fact, they would encourage others to participate. They felt that the amount of work required by the project was about as much as they expected. While they were not generally optimistic that their projects would be fully implemented in 1986-87, and consequently did not

feel that it would impact student achievement, they did think that the project will impact student achievement next year. Finally, they felt that the District Chapter 1 staff was supportive of their project.

Their biggest concern regarding the project was that they needed additional time to plan and implement the project. See Appendix E for additional comments on this questionnaire.

The PIP Workshop Series Questionnaire:

The purpose of the questionnaire was to evaluate the five major workshop activities in reaching their intended outcomes and in helping the schools identify their project's design. It also asked participants identify possible changes that could improve workshop activities. Each activity is discussed separately. Additional comments from leadership team members are reported in Appendix F.

Achievement Profiling: Leadership teams found the task of profiling the students' achievement very helpful in identifying their project goal. They felt the activity could be even more beneficial if they were provided with longitudinal data and a detailed interpretation of the data.

Program Self-Assessment: Again, leadership teams found the activity helpful in determining the intended outcome, identifying a target area. Comments on how to improve the activity varied

considerably.

Reviewing Research Articles: The research articles only helped half the members from the leadership teams become more familiar with the research, perhaps because many of them were already familiar with the research. In addition, the majority of members felt the review was not important in determining the final design of their project. They suggested to place little or no workshop time into this activity.

Review of practices in effective schools: Respondents were about equally divided on deciding whether this activity helped them determine a strategy to address their target area, although most thought the exercise was not very useful in determining their final design. The weakness was that the descriptions of the strategies were too general to be very useful.

Management and Monitoring Matrix: All members felt the Management and Monitoring Matrix was helpful in establishing their implementation plan, but they had many suggestions to improve it. They found it a very difficult instrument to work with and suggested that a new form be created incorporating their suggestions.

Conclusions:

1) The project was successful in gaining and maintaining the interest of four schools in program improvement.

2) All four schools intend to continue their implementation plans in 1987-1988.

3) The duration of the project was too short to expect a measurable impact on student achievement in 1986-87.

4) District Chapter 1 staff built a closer relationship with school Chapter 1 staffs at the four schools.

5) Program improvement appears to have taken hold in significant areas within the schools.

Recommendations:

1) Additional resources (teacher-substitute time) should be allocated to schools in order to provide team members the necessary time to plan their projects.

2) The workshop series should be modified based on the information gathered from the evaluation questionnaire administered at the end of the year.

3) Schools should be monitored more closely in order to determine their needs and assist them in a successful implementation of their plans.

APPENDIX A

13 ATTRIBUTES OF EFFECTIVE CHAPTER 1 PROGRAMS

1) Clear goals and objectives
2) Coordination with the regular school program/other special programs
3) Parent/community involvement
4) Professional development and training
5) Strong leadership
6) Appropriate instructional materials, methods and approaches
7) High expectations for student learning and behavior
8) Closely monitored student progress
9) Regular feedback and reinforcement
10) Excellence recognized and rewarded
11) Positive school/classroom climate
12) Maximum use of academic learning time
13) Evaluation results used for project improvement

APPENDIX B

BEACH SCHOOL

MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING MATRIX

Target Area: Correlation of Reading & Math Instruction between

Prescription: Chapter I and homeroom

1. Implementation of In-Focus card
2. Chapter I staff share "Parent Report" - diagnostic information with homeroom teacher.

1. GOAL: To achieve academic gain in reading and math equivalent to district growth grades 3-5th, 1" and 2" - 1 stanine point gain.

End Point: May, 1987

4. STATUS TODAY What is the situation like today in each KRA?	5. ACTIVITIES What must be done to get from 4 to 3? (Indicate in parentheses for each activity, who is responsible.)	6. SCHEDULE (MONTHS)	3. KEY RESULT AREAS Consolidate indicators into 3 or 4 key areas in which improvement would make the biggest difference in attaining the goal.	2. INDICATORS If the prescription is implemented, what would ideally be happening? What would the target area look or be like? (8 - 12 indicators)
A. Informal communication between Chapter I and homeroom teachers in regard to individual academic needs.	1/2 day leadership and grade level team plan to develop In-Focus Card	Frame / Monitor	A. In-Focus Card Development: A. Team design B. Teacher review C. Revision D. Working draft	IN-FOCUS CARD 1. Administrators support and promote plan. 2. Develop In-Focus Card 3. Team leaders present plan to team 4. Teachers gain ownership 5. Teachers follow plan 6. Chapter I teacher monitor 7. Cards will address specific area of student need, in areas of reading and math 8. Instructional techniques used will be appropriate to students with reading/math problems 9. Mid-year evaluation by leadership team 10. Modify and replan if necessary
	Grade Level Team Leaders Presentation	F / M		
	Incorporate Feedback	F / M		
	Working Draft	F / M		
B. Periodically ADMS & FALT scores of individual students are communicated to homeroom students.	Leadership team plan for implementation	F / M	B. Implementation A. Leadership team plan B. Grade level teacher feedback C. Working draft	PARENT REPORT 1. Chapter I teacher distribute parent report to each teacher. 2. Homeroom teacher will use parent report as a major resource in planning the In-Focus Card.
	Grade Level Team Leaders Presentation	F / M		
	Incorporate Feedback	F / M		
	Working Draft	F / M		
C. N/A	Implement In-Focus Card	F / M	C. Pilot A. Grade level monitoring and feedback. (✓list, chart, and satisfaction survey).	
	Maintain ✓ list of use	F / M		
	Satisfaction Survey Form	F / M		
		F / M		
D. Currently homeroom teacher gets copy for parent.	Distribute to teachers - file copy of parent report	F / M	D. Parent Report Copy sent to homeroom teacher.	
		F / M		
		F / M		

APPENDIX B
(Continued)

Buckman School — MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING MATRIX — 1-28-87

Target Area: Parent/Community Involvement

Prescription: To provide opportunities for parent/community involvement in achieving success in reading and word meaning.

1. GOAL: To improve reading skills, especially in the area of word meaning.

End Point: July 1, 1987

4. STATUS TODAY What is the situation like today in each KRA?	5. ACTIVITIES What must be done to get from 4 to 3? (Indicate in parentheses for each activity, who is responsible.)	6. SCHEDULE (MONTHS) Oct Nov Dec Jan Feb Mar Apr May June	3. KEY RESULT AREAS Consolidate indicators into 3 or 4 key areas in which improvement would make the biggest difference in attaining the goal.	2. INDICATORS If the prescription is implemented, what would ideally be happening? What would the target area look or be like? (8 - 12 indicators)
A. No formal plan for involving parents in their children's reading program.	1) Staff planning for involvement. (Ch. 1 Coor, team ldrs, Jacquie Burns, staff)	F: X ... X ... X ... X; Monitor: dates, minutes, meeting notes	A. School personnel and parents support reading success through good lines of communication (indicators 1 & 5)	1) Twenty-five percent of Chapter 1 parents attend open house.
	2) Staff brainstorms and prioritizes parent involvement activities. (Coord., Jacquie Burns, Eval. spec.)	F: X ... X; M: notes		2) Thirty percent of Chapter parents are aware of Chapter 1 goals in readir for their children.
	3) Assess implementation (Coordinator)	F: May X; M: May survey		3) Parents actively support success in reading with their own improved attitudes towards the reading process.
B. Little communication from parents and home to the school. Most communication is written. Discipline is the main topic. Parents are heard from only after a serious problem.	1) Ch. 1 sponsors Parent Open House. (Coord., teachers, parents)	F: X; M: tally number of participants	B. Student achievement is a shared responsibility among students, teachers, administration, community, and parents. (Indicators 2 and 3)	4) Instructional materials/ techniques coordinated with content area.
	2) Ch. 1 sponsors Parent Workshop on Reading (Coord., CDS, principal)	F: X; M: tally number of participants		5) Thirty percent of Chapter 1 parents respond positively to the Buckman reading program survey.
C. Little coordination with parents or regular classroom on developing word meaning skills for Chapter 1 students.	1) Newsletters to parents (Coordinator)	F: X ... X ... X ... X ... X; M: newsletter file	C. Materials identified to support district curriculum in reading and word meaning. (Indicator 4)	
	2) Ask for suggestions/ input from staff & parents (Coordinator and staff)	F: X ... X ... X; M: meeting notes		
	3) Survey to parents & teachers (Eval. spec.)	F: May X; M: May tally & report		
D.			D.	

APPENDIX B
(Continued)

Chief Joseph

MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING MATRIX

Target Area: Coordination with Regular School Program

Prescription: Developing a model with staff to examine present program and to better coordinate an achievement program for the entire school.

1. GOAL: Increase Student reading skill achievement.

End Point:

4. STATE TODAY What is the situation like today in each KRA?	5. ACTIVITIES What must be done to get from 4 to 3? (Indicate in parentheses for each activity, who is responsible.)	6. SCHEDULE (MONTHS)	3. KEY RESULT AREAS Consolidate indicators into 3 or 4 key areas in which improvement would make the biggest difference in attaining the goal.	2. INDICATORS If the prescription is implemented, what would ideally be happening? What would the target area look or be like? (8 - 12 indicators)
A. Program Plan No integrated building plan. Have a good, well-trained staff Some parental involvement (especially 2nd grade) Teacher support with potential for more in future. Excellent Administrative support	Meet with KanYagi to discuss scores and develop strategy for sharing with staff and involving them developing model (Mary, Laurel, Joanne) Meet with staff -Introduce plan idea -Develop plan -Provide followup plan start program and use consistant monetoring techniques. (Mary, Laurel, Joanne)	Frame Monitor F M F M F M	A. Staff Development and and Implementation of plan	1. Staff develop plan. 2. Staff and Administrators support and follow plan. 3. Plan will include a precise objective monitoring system. 4. Materials corordinated with content/skills. 5. Address specific areas of student need. 6. Instructional techniques will compliment students needs. 7. Parents are aware of the plan and their responsibilities. 8. A fair, objective, systematic structure selection procedure is used.
B. Abuntdant Materials District expectations & guidelines, also testing - Well-defined curriculum - No systematic plan for student identification or teacher referral. - Lack of content integration especially regarding areas missed when student is out of homeroom	#1 Develop simple format for teacher referral (Laurel) #2 Coordinate simple concise form of content communication ~~schedules (lessen plans)~~ (Laurel) #3 Coordinate use of Chapter ~~1 material outside of~~ Chapter 1 room (i.e. homeroom) (Laurel)	F M F M F M	B. Student needs identified How to - Materials - Techniques - Test data - Student needs	
C. Existing Parent Involvement - 2nd grade parent/child reading program - 1st grade-limited parental help with letters and sounds - 3rd- 5th little to no direct parental involvement. - Have some parental communications written and oral but need to have more systematic approach to communicating student and program needs	#1 communicate to parents (especially during conferences) ~~the need for more~~ direct involvement.(Laurel) #2 Develop systematic,regual communication with parents (Laurel) #3 Develop brochure/flyer/ booklet explaining program goals, objectives and inform parents of classrom procedures and exopectations. (Laurel) #4 develop plan for parents to use for ~~home support of~~ program/also ideas for working with their child.	F M F M F M F M F M F M	C. Parental involvement and follow-up.	
			D.	

APPENDIX B
(Continued)

Tubman Middle School ACE Project

MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING MATRIX

1-29-87

Target Area: Coordination of Curriculum in Chapter 1 and Regular Classrooms

Prescription: To develop and implement a coordinated plan between regular classroom and Chapter 1 teachers for addressing literal comprehension and word problem solving skills.

1. GOAL: To increase the effectiveness of Chapter 1 by increasing the literal comprehension and word problem-solving skill of students as measured by PALT.

End Point: June 1987

4. STATUS TODAY What is the situation like today in each KRA?	5. ACTIVITIES What must be done to get from 4 to 3? (Indicate in parentheses for each activity, who is responsible.)	6. SCHEDULE (MONTHS) Nov Dec Jan Feb Mar Apr May June	3. KEY RESULT AREAS Consolidate indicators into 3 or 4 key areas in which improvement would make the biggest difference in attaining the goal.	2. INDICATORS If the prescription is implemented, what would ideally be happening? What would the target area look or be like? (8 - 12 indicators)
A. No formal coordination of curriculum and instruction exists between regular classroom and Chapter 1 teachers.	1) Identify coordination plan. (Principal)	Frame X Monitor (Plan)	A. Students receive Chapter 1 instruction that coordinates with regular classroom instruction.	1) Teachers meet biweekly to coordinate curriculum.
	2) Teachers meet biweekly. (Team Leader)	F ----------> H (minutes)		2) Teachers develop plan.
	3) Teachers develop team plan that specifies instructional skills to be addressed each week. (Curr. Coor.)	F ----------> H (team plan)		3) Teachers follow plan.
		F H		4) Administrators support and promote plan.
B. There is no assessment of what instructional materials are available in Chapter 1 for literal comprehension and word problem skills and whether these materials are aligned with district curriculum.	1) List curr. materials on literal comprehension and word problems	F X X H (list of materials)	B. Chapter 1 materials for word problem and literal comprehension skills are aligned with District curriculum and and regular classroom instruction.	5) Materials aligned with classroom and district curriculums.
	2) Identify gaps between instructional materials & Dist. Curr	F X X H (list of gaps)		6) Address appropriate level of student need.
	3) Prioritize list of needed instructional materials.	F X X H (list of needed materials)		7) Address specific areas of student need.
	4) Obtain needed materials.	F X X X H (obtain materials)		8) Transition from regular classroom to Chapter 1 is smooth and orderly.
C. The structure of Chapter 1 program is seen as disruptive by regular classroom teachers because it causes a loss of "time-on-task".	1) Visit other Ch 1 programs with different organizational structures. (Lee & Linda)	F X H (visitations)	C. The Chapter 1 program operations are restructured.	9) The amount of "time-on-task" is increased.
	2) Obtain staff recommendations. (Lee and Arlella)	F X H (list of suggestions)		
	3) Notify parents of proposed changes and obtain input. (Lee & Linda)	F X X X H (Parent meeting)		
	4) Identify alternative program structures. (Linda & Lee)	F X H list)		
D.	5) Select program structure. (Paul, Linda, Lee	F X X H (select structure)	D.	
		F H		
		F H		

APPENDIX C

CHAPTER 1
PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PROJECT EVALUATION

Instructions: Use the scales provided and circle the number to indicate your response to each item.

1. Prior to the workshop series, how receptive were you to being a part of the Chapter 1 Program Improvement Project?

Not Receptive				Very Receptive
1(0)	2(1)	3(2)	4(3)	5(5)

2. After the workshop series, how willing were you to continue the Chapter 1 Program Improvement Project?

Not Willing				Very Willing
1(0)	2(0)	3(3)	4(2)	5(5)

3. How did the amount of work required for the project compare with what you expected?

Less Than I Expected				More than I Expected
1(0)	2(1)	3(6)	4(1)	5(2)

4. How optimistic are you that the project will be fully implemented by the end of this school year?

Not Optimistic				Very Optimistic
1(3)	2(1)	3(3)	4(0)	5(2)

5a. How much will student achievement increase beyond the current level <u>this year</u> as a result of your project?

Very Little				A Lot
1(4)	2(2)	3(3)	4(0)	5(0)

5b. How much will it <u>next year?</u>

Very Little				A Lot
1(0)	2(1)	3(3)	4(2)	5(3)

6. Prior to participating in the Program Improvement Project, how familiar were you with the effective schools literature?

Not Familiar				Very Familiar
1(3)	2(0)	3(2)	4(1)	5(4)

7. Based on your experience with the Program Improvement Project, to what extent would you encourage other schools to participate in the project?

Not Encourage				Encourage A Lot
1(0)	2(1)	3(3)	4(1)	5(4)

8. How helpful has the District Chapter 1 staff been in supporting you with your project?

Not Helpful				Very Helpful
1(0)	2(2)	3(0)	4(0)	5(7)

9. What kind of help do you expect you will need from NWREL or the District Chapter 1 staff to successfully implement your project in school year 1987-88? Be specific.

APPENDIX D

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PROJECT QUESTIONNAIRE

The Chapter 1 Program Improvement Project workshop series included five major activities. Below is a list of these activities, a brief description of each and the intended outcome.

Following the descriptions are questions for each activity. Please circle the number that indicates your answer for each question. Your answers are important in planning the program for the coming year.

ACTIVITY (and description)

1. Achievement Profiling: (The achievement data were graphed and analyzed).

INTENDED OUTCOME: Identify project goal, eg., improve reading skills.

a. To what extent did the achievement profiling help you to identify the project goal?

not helpful				very helpful
1(0)	2(0)	3(0)	4(4)	5(5)

b. What would you change to improve achievement profiling?

2. Program Self-Assessment (Each school answered a series of questions regarding their program).

INTENDED OUTCOME: Identify target area, eg., coordinate curriculum, parent involvement.

a. To what extent did the program self-assessment help you to identify the target area?

not helpful				very helpful
1(0)	2(0)	3(4)	4(3)	5(2)

b. What would you change to improve the program self-assessment?

3. Read Research Articles (Each person was assigned one or two articles to read and summarize).

INTENDED OUTCOME: To focus attention on the research literature and those practices found to be effective in schools.

a. To what extent did the research review exercise familiarize you with the effective schools research?

very little				very much
1(4)	2(1)	3(0)	4(4)	5(1)

b. How important was the research review exercise in determining the final design of the project?

not important				very important
1(2)	2(4)	3(1)	4(2)	5(0)

c. What would you change to improve the research review exercise?

4. Review Effective Practices in Identified Schools. (Schools reviewed Chapter 1 programs identified as effective in target areas).

INTENDED OUTCOME: To identify and select from alternate strategies a plan to address target area.

a. To what extent did the review of effective school practices help you determine a strategy to address your target area?

not helpful				very helpful
1(2)	2(1)	3(4)	4(3)	5(0)

b. How useful was the review of effective school practices in determining the final design of the program?

not useful				very useful
1(0)	2(6)	3(2)	4(2)	5(0)

c. What would you change to improve the review of effective school practices activity?

5. **Management and Monitoring Matrix** (Schools completed a matrix identifying activities, responsibilities and a schedule to implement the project).

INTENDED OUTCOME: To establish an implementation plan.

a. To what extent did completing the management and monitoring matrix help you establish an implementation plan?

not helpful				very helpful
1(0)	2(0)	3(2)	4(3)	5(5)

b. What would you change to improve completing the management and monitoring matrix activity?

Please feel free to make any comment you wish about the Program Improvement Project or those associated with it.

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PROJECT EVALUATION

9. What kind of help do you expect you will need from NWREL or the District Chapter 1 staff to successfully implement your project in school year 1987-88? Be specific.

More direct involvement and participation in the leadership team. Both a representative from the Chapter 1 staff and NWREL. Also provide the necessary time to plan together as a team.

Time is always an issue - sub time for planning team to work with the principal in the building would be wonderful!

Evaluation of prescriptive learning program to meet the literal comprehension goals.

Evaluation of next year's program.

I was never "monitored" by NWREL - unless they contacted someone else at my school - which has left me with a slightly "strange" feeling. I would really need some help in the area of planning evening meetings for parents - and I feel that my extended responsibility pay should be increased to cover the extra evening activities - somehow I need to include these costs in the budget for next year. Easy one would be to get the booklet from Oregon Department of Ed. on Chapter I from Salem for my parents and community.

I feel we have the information and instructional materials, ideas, etc. complete and can implement the project in the next school year. However, I feel that our Chapter I program is already providing individual need instruction and based on our school enrollment we are making exceptional gains even though we are below district average on test scores. According to a meeting with the evaluation department we are making gains in the upper 20% of the district. Additional time should be allocated to work on the project.

We will be implementing a completely new program, based on a commercial package--Prescription Learning Laboratory, beginning with the 1987-88 school year. (The decision to abandon the old program and build a new Chapter I program from scratch was a direct result of the Program Improvement process.) During the time the program is being established the only expertise we will have concerning its design and most effective

operation will come from the sales staff of the commercial package's vendor.
We would appreciate research information regarding the most effective use of this package or type of package. We would also like to have short-term evaluative instruments to allow us to make corrective changes during the formative stages of the program. And we would like to have some help evaluating our overall Chapter I program in light of the drastic changes we are making.

Other comments:

I was pleased with the information--organization--and the support from the district offices.

I really felt that this was a "canned" project for NWREL - there didn't seem to be any "Portland" emphasis-or large metro area specialization-maybe that's asking too much to want - e.g., dealing with mobility-overcoming apathy.

APPENDIX F

PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT PROJECT QUESTIONNAIRE

1b. What would you change to improve achievement profiling?

More input as to interpretation.

More time to evaluate.

This takes more time - or needed more in my mind. Stephanie really helped us here!

Individual (In-Focus) Card will need to be redesigned and continued to be implemented.

Again - more time - more staff involved would be ideal.

Profile 2-3 years of achievement data, not just one year.

2b. What would you change to improve the program self-assessment?

Do this activity as school PIP team in a workshop setting.

We didn't need to spend the amount of time as we basically knew what we needed to improve to implement the project.

Do it at the workshop with our team.

3c. What would you change to improve the research review exercise?

Have it more specialized to the individual school needs.

Many I was already aware of.

Not spend quite as much time doing this.

Let us have readings prior to the workshop for reading - it took a great deal of the time allotted to the workshop.

Read the articles on our time and report at a scheduled meeting time.

Identify knowledge base of participants.

Continue to use the "Jigsaw" cooperative learning model, it was effective.

4c. What would you change to improve the review of effective school practices activity?

These were too general. It would be helpful to have someone come into our building and review our own program.

Not enough detail for each program.

If we had the larger handbook on parent involvement that we received later it would have been a bonus.

Provide more time to develop matrix and project plan.

5b. What would you change to improve completing the management and monitoring matrix activity?

Have a two-year matrix - Too much of this year had lapped.

Build matrix for a longer period of time.

It was helpful to see everything written on the matrix but, the technical process of writing it out was a difficult one.

This was the very most frustrating part of the workshop series for me. I could see that this was the real "meat" - or the master plan for the project - and I was overloaded with information and needed time to complete this tool. When the evaluation specialist and I sat down and finally completed it, we found it not as overwhelming as it looked - maybe a step-by-step could be done - somehow earlier in the day - 2:30 seemed terribly late in the day to accomplish this activity.

Design a different form - left to right with:

Goal	Timeline
Objective	
Implementation	
Evaluation	